

Application Number:	23/00458/HOUS
Location:	71 Shelfield Lane Rochdale OL11 5XY
Proposal:	Two-storey side and single storey rear extension, alteration to front and rear dormers including addition of pitch roof following demolition of existing rear conservatory- Resubmission of 22/01525/HOUS
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs Jakeman
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
Recommendation:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	No
	Contrary to previous decision?	No
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	No

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	No
	Neighbour comments received?	No

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	No
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

71 Shelfield Lane is a two-storey semi-detached dormer bungalow located in the Norden ward of Rochdale. The dwelling benefits from generous front and rear garden space with a detached garage to the rear together with both front and rear dormers. The dwelling currently hosts a 3m rear conservatory which is to be demolished to make way for the proposed works. The property is sited on a residential estate that comprises a mixture of dwelling types, forms, scale and design, with a medium-high degree of uniformity.

Description of Proposal

Permission is sought for a two-storey side extension projecting 2.3m from the side elevation extending up to the common boundary shared with 69 Shelfield Lane. The extension would match the existing ridge height and be set back 1m from the existing front elevation.

Permission is also sought for the addition of a pitched roof increasing the existing eaves height from 2.3m to 5.3m as well as the continuation of the existing front and rear dormers to extend over the side extension. The existing conservatory will be demolished to make way for a proposed 3m single storey lean-to extension spanning the full width of the rear elevation.

Relevant History

22/01525/HOUS

Two-storey side and single storey rear extension, alteration to front and rear dormers including addition of pitch roof following demolition of existing rear conservatory

Refused 03.04.2023

1. *By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed two-storey side extension would represent an incongruous form of development and not appear to visually respect the built form and character of the host dwelling. The extension would appear at odds with the character of the surrounding dwellings, resulting in visual harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework*

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

Highways and Engineering

The main highway concern regarding this application is parking provision.

The planning application form indicates that there would be no impact on parking provision however the loss some of the existing driveway would seem to have some impact. For the size of the extended dwelling Council standards would require the provision of two off street parking spaces and the submitted plans seems to show the garden being converted to a driveway. If this is the intention we would ask that the existing vehicle access crossing is widened to accommodate the extended vehicular access.

The servicing arrangements for the dwelling would remain unchanged.

If approved the development should not have any impact on road safety or highways capacity.

Highways raise no objection to this application subject to the clarification of the proposed parking arrangements

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding neighbours. One public comment was receive

Objection Letter

Existing conservatory built following no neighbour consultation which obstructs daylight to surrounding property

Officer Response: *Existing conservatory was built under Permitted Development therefore required no neighbour consultations via a planning application*

Proposed rear extension will result in increased light restriction to surrounding property

Officer Response: *See amenity section of report*

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P3 Improving Design of New Development

DM1 General Development Requirements

T2 Improving Accessibility

Appendix 5 Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 124 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF also states "Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning document". Core Strategy policy P3 requires all new developments to enhance the borough's identity and sense of place and ensure that buildings contribute positively to the townscape.

Further to the previously refused application, it is noted the plans have changed slightly to include a 1m set back of the two-storey side extension from the front elevation. However, as much of the proposal would remain the same as the one previously refused, it is not considered the set back is so significant that it would overcome concerns outlined in the previous report.

As per the last application, the proposed works as a whole would constitute significant overdevelopment of the plot so much that it would change the nature of the character of the house which would appear at odds with those surrounding and would remain largely unacceptable given its lack of subservience. It is acknowledged paragraph 5.12 of the SPD has now been adhered to with the new plans proposing a 1m set back to overcome the terracing concern and would remain to principally respect the existing building line however, when proposed

together with the roof addition therefore significantly increasing the massing of the dwelling, this would lead to, as a whole, an incongruous scheme of development and one which would not be appropriate in this location.

Both the single storey rear extension and dormer extensions are considered to remain acceptable (providing the two-storey side extension was acceptable as a whole) and are not considered to detrimentally alter the visual appearance of the existing dwelling.

In view of the above assessment, the design of the proposal is therefore unacceptable and would not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF. With reference to the previously refused application, it is considered previous concerns have not been addressed to overcome the issue of overdevelopment of the plot and incongruous additions.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

The single storey extension would conform to paragraph 5.6 of the SPD and not extend beyond a point 3 metres when measured along the common boundary and the marginal increase in height is not considered to pose any harmful impact to surrounding neighbours with reference to loss of light and overbearing/overlooking impacts.

As with the previous application, in the instance of an approval, it would be deemed necessary that in order to avoid any potential overlooking impact to the rear garden of no.69 facilitated by the upper floor rear window, for a condition to be attached to the decision notice for this window to be obscurely glazed as this window would host a bathroom and not a principal window to a habitable room.

It is indicated all principal and habitable room windows would conform to Section 4 Space Standards and the harm of the loss of light posed to the upper floor side window of the adjacent house is not considered to be so severe it would be unacceptable as it is not a principal window to a habitable room. All habitable rooms are to receive adequate light and outlook.

Sufficient garden space is to be retained to the rear post development. With the extension constructed up to the common boundary, this would eliminate the existing side entrance from the front garden to the rear however the loss of space is not thought to be so significant it would be unacceptable.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking: DM1 and T2, Appendix 5

Proposed plans indicate the property will increase from a 3-bed to a 4-bed dwelling. Current arrangements allow for designated parking space to the side of the dwelling. Post development, plans indicate the existing grassed space to the front of the dwelling will be converted into a designated parking area. For a dwelling of this size, Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy requires a maximum of two spaces per dwelling therefore given the plans indicate this space can be accommodated post-development to the front of the dwelling, the proposed parking arrangements would therefore be acceptable.

In the instance the application was an approval, following comments from the highways officer, to extend the existing driveway to provide alternative parking

arrangements would be acceptable providing the existing vehicle access crossing is widened which would require a separate dropped kerb agreement from the highways dept.

Pending an agreement with highways to extend the existing dropped kerb, the proposed parking arrangements would therefore be acceptable and in accordance with policies T2 and DM1

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design and siting, the proposed works would represent overdevelopment of the existing plot and detrimentally increase the massing of the dwelling so much that it would not appear to respect the surrounding settings. The works would be out of keeping with the row of semi-detached bungalows and would not be appropriate in this location. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	06.06.2023	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	07.07.2023	Signed: TH

Notes for Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, this decision relates to the following plans:

- 27.10.22 6 LOCATION PLAN
- 27.10.22 4 PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT
- 27.10.22 PROPOSED EXTENSIONS

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo